REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the examination of the application. In view of the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1 – 8, 10 – 15, and 17 – 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 6,130,757, hereinafter *Yoshida*, in combination with USP 6,741,367, hereinafter *Watanabe*, and further in view of US 2003/0103777, hereinafter *Nakamura*. Claims 9 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshida*, in combination with *Watanabe*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,934,046, hereinafter *Nishikawa*.

The Examiner relies upon *Yoshida* for an alleged teaching of a data processing apparatus comprising one or more compression/decompression units that compress the data for the input job and decompress the compressed data. The Examiner acknowledges that *Yoshida* does not expressly disclose a controller that, when a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by said compression/decompression units during processing of the data for a current job by said compression/decompression units, and controls the execution of processing of data for said next job by said compression/decompression units in accordance with this determination.

To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner relies on *Watanabe*. In particular, the Examiner alleges that *Watanabe* "discloses a controller, wherein when a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by said compression/decompression units during processing of the data for a current job by said compression/decompression units", and for "controlling the execution of

processing of said next job by said compression/decompression units in accordance **with this determination**". To support this conclusion, the Examiner relies upon Figures 1 and 10, and column 1, lines 23 - 26 and line 56 through column 2, line 19; column 2, lines 43 - 56, and column 11, lines 57 - 64 of *Watanabe*.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's analysis. Among other things, the cited "with this determination" refers to a determination made in step (d) of claim 1, i.e., "determining whether or not said processing wait period is longer than said minimum processing time, based on a comparison between the minimum processing time for said next job data and said processing wait period". However, since the Office Action acknowledges that *Yoshida* (as modified by *Watanabe*) does not teach or suggest the determination of step (d), it cannot teach or suggest "controlling the execution of processing of said next job by said compression/decompression units in accordance **with this determination**". And, since the determination is an important part of the controlling, it cannot be said that *Yoshida* or *Watanabe* teaches or suggests "controlling the execution of processing of said next job by said compression/decompression units in accordance **with this determination**".

The Office Action further alleges that *Nakamura* teaches, among other things, obtaining the processing wait period between pages of said current job, comparing the processing wait period between pages of said current job with the minimum processing time for said next job data, and determining whether or not said processing wait period is longer than said minimum processing time, based on a comparison between the minimum processing time for said next job data and said processing wait period. The Office Action refers to paragraphs [0105] and [0106],

and Figures 9A through 9E as allegedly teaching this feature. Paragraphs [0105]

and [0106] state:

> [0105] As revealed by the comparison of waiting times A-W and B-W for job A and job B illustrated in FIG. 9D and FIG. 9E, respectively, the overall print waiting time in (sum of waiting time for job A and waiting time for job B) in FIG. 9E is shorter than the overall print waiting time (sum of waiting time for job A and waiting time for job B) in FIG. 9D, by the time period indicated by the shaded portion of FIG. 9D.

> [0106] In other words, since priority rankings are assigned after bitmap development, it is possible to prioritise print processing for jobs having a shorter print processing time (here taken as a job having fewer pages to be printed) and hence the overall print waiting time can be shortened. In the prior art, since the transfer and development times are predicted, these predictions are not necessarily accurate, and since the priority rankings are determined before data transfer, results such as that illustrated in FIG. 9D may arise, where shortening of the overall print waiting time cannot be achieved.

Although *Nakamura* discusses "overall print waiting time", there is no teaching

or suggestion of the processing wait period between pages of a current job.

According to a preferred embodiment of the present invention, a calculation is

made based, in part, on the processing wait period ***between*** pages. See, e.g.,

paragraph [0075] of the published application:

> [0075] In S107, the next-page decompression wait period for the current job and the minimum processing time (also termed the `processing unit time`) for the requested job are compared based on the output from the above subroutine, and if the next-page decompression wait period is longer (the determination in S107 is YES), i.e., if it is confirmed that there will be no decline in printing productivity even if processing for the requested job is carried out, the routine for switching to the requested job is executed to the extent possible and is then ended in S108.

None of the applied prior art references considers or uses such a calculation.

Accordingly, the combination of references cannot teach or suggest the claimed

invention. Claim 11 includes language similar to that discussed above with respect

to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1 - 3, 11 - 20, and 22 are patentable over the applied art.

Claims 4 - 10 and 21 include a controller, wherein when a processing request is issued for processing of the data for a next job by said compression/decompression unit(s) during processing of the data for a current job by said compression/decompression unit(s), said controller performs processing comprising:

a) *identifying an attribute of said next job*,

b) determining whether processing of data for said next job by said compression/decompression unit(s) within the processing wait period is possible or not, *based on said identified next job attribute*, and

c) controlling the execution of processing of data for said next job by said compression/decompression unit(s) between pages of said current job in accordance with this determination.

With regard to claim 4, the Office Action merely states that it contains substantially the same subject matter as claim 1. However, claim 1 and the current Office Action are both silent with regard to *identifying an attribute of said next job*, and determining whether processing of data for said next job by said compression/decompression unit(s) within the processing wait period is possible or not, *based on said identified next job attribute*. Accordingly, the Office Action does not provide any basis for rejecting claims 4 - 10 and 21.

Claims 9 and 16 depend from claims 4 and 11, respectively. Claims 4 and 11 have been rejected over *Yoshida*, *Watanabe*, and *Nakamura*. However, the

rejections of claims 9 and 16 do not include *Nakamura*. Accordingly, the rejections

of claims 9 and 16 is also in error for at least this reason.

Accordingly, all of the rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicants reserve the right to further challenge the Examiner's analysis of the

individual references, and/or the motivation to combine the references in the manner

proposed by the Examiner at a later time, if necessary and appropriate.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the

application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the

undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: <u>November 17, 2010</u>   By: <u>/WCRowland/</u>
                                            William C. Rowland
                                            Registration No. 30888

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620